REMARKS

Claims 20, 21, 23-27, 29-36, and 39-43 are pending. Claims 20 and 43 are objected to for informalities. Claims 20, 21, 23-27, 29-32, 39, 40, 42, and 43 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over US patent 6,801,540 (Jeong) in view of US patent 6,584,076 (Avaramudan et al.) and US pub. 2001/0002927 (Detampel, et al.). Claims 33-36 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jeong in view of Avaramudan, Detampel, and US pub. 2001/0043608 (Potter, et al.). Claim 41 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jeong in view of Avaramudan, Detampel, and US patent 6,819,665 (Pinard, et al).

Claims 20, 39, 41-43 are amended herein. No new matter is added. Claims 20, 21, 23-27, 29-36, and 39-43 are presented for examination.

Specification amendment

Paragraph 62 is amended herein to correct a typographical error in which the gatekeeper module 21 was mistakenly identified as element 20b. The correction is supported by the remainder of the specification, for example in par 53 below.

> Applicants' par. 53: "*As shown in FIG. 2, the PBX computers (here: the PBX computer 15 a , and correspondingly also the—constructed and set up in the same way as PBX computer 15 a —PBX computers 5 , 15 b) feature for this purpose at least one module 20 a which takes over the function of the gateway (or a number, e.g. between two and seven, gateway modules 20 b , which are constructed and set up in a similar way to gateway module 20 a), as well as a (especially precisely one) module 21 which takes over a gatekeeper function.*"

Claim amendments

Claim 43 is corrected as required by Examiner.

Claim 20 is corrected to match the terminology of its base claim 39. Two data processing devices were originally described and claimed (abstract, lines 4-8: "*The computer contains a telephone conference and/or video conference data processing device, which supports a first*

data transmission protocol, and contains <u>*another data processing device*</u> *that supports both the first as well as the second protocol,*". To clarify that these are separate elements, the claim amendment of 03-26-2008 renamed the second data processing device "interface" (24), as discussed in the remarks of that response.

The independent claims 39, 41, and 42 are amended herein to clarify their scope. No new matter is added by these amendments. The limitation of a "*single gatekeeper module*" is found in par. 53, lines 8-9. The limitation "*wherein all conversions between the first and second protocols are performed in the gatekeeper for the plurality of gateway modules*" is found in par. 59, lines 7-15 and is reinforced in par. 70, all lines.

> MPEP 2106 (C): "*An applicant can always amend a claim during prosecution to better reflect the intended scope of the claim.*"

<u>Response to rejections under 35 USC 103</u>

Crucial distinctions exist between Applicants' invention as claimed and the system of Jeong as modified by Examiner. Applicant provides an interface device 24 in a gatekeeper module 21 that provides protocol conversions for multiple gateways 20a, 20b. Per Applicants' par. 62, lines 8-13: *"By contrast an interface device 24 provided at the gatekeeper module* ~~*20 b*~~ <u>*21*</u> *takes care - as required - of either TDM/PCM or H.225/H.245 protocol-based data transmission (e.g. -- via the line 9 b - via the internal Intranet data network B, or - for example via the line 19 a - externally over the Internet)".* This eliminates a need for protocol conversions in each gateway 20a, 20b, which provides a uniform system control interface for clients with different protocols, and reduces stack license costs by eliminating multiple conversion modules (par. 70: "*In this case, by the modularization/splitting of the gatekeeper and gateway functions onto different modules, H.323 stack license costs can be saved.*")

In contrast, Jeong provides a protocol conversion module in each gateway 21, and a different protocol conversion module in a call converter 17 attached between two gatekeepers

17 and 19. Below, Applicants' have interpreted the term "property" in Jeong to mean "proprietary".

> Jeong col. 4, lines 32-42: "*a property gate keeper **19** which is activated in order to receive a message from the property terminal when the call signal is a terminal supporting the property protocol, a call converter **17** which receives a call signal originated form the H.323 protocol or the property terminal and converts the H.323 protocol of the call signal into the property protocol or the property protocol of the call signal into the H.323 protocol when the H.323 terminal is connected to the property terminal or the property terminal is connected to the H.323 terminal between the H.323 gate keeper **15** and the property gate keeper **19**"*

> Jeong col. 4, lines 51-61: "*In addition, a H.323 gate way **21** which converts a PSTN signal into a H.323 signal and converts on the contrary is comprised in order to make the H.323 terminals **401** , **403** , . . . and the property terminal **501** , **503** , **505** , . . . connected to local area network communicate to the terminals connected to external PSTN, and an office interface unit **25** which is inputted a PSTN signal from PSTN and transmits it to the H.323 gate way **21** or is inputted a call signal from the H.323 gate way **21** , generates a DTMF signal corresponding to the call signal and transmits it to a terminal connected to the PSTN is comprised.*"

This requires twice as many gatekeepers as in Applicants' system, requires multiple protocol converters, and requires two different types of protocol converter modules.

The proposed combinations of Jeong with Avaramudan, Detampel, Potter, and Pinard do not address the above deficiency of Jeong. Avaramudan's device servers 101 may be considered to correspond to Applicants' gateways 20a, 20b. However, each of Avaramudan's device servers 101 performs protocol conversions to a common call-control protocol. This is the exact opposite of Applicants' configuration, in which an interface 24 in a single gatekeeper 21 performs all protocol conversions for a plurality of gateways, thus providing a uniform system control interface and eliminating duplication of conversion modules.

> Avaramudan col. 3, lines 1-6: "*Device servers **101** are protocol translators which translate the protocol of a device being served by the device server to a common call control protocol. Each of device servers **101** include at least a control unit **109** and they each may also include a packet circuit gateway **111** to handle the media portion, e.g., voice and/or video, of the call.*"

Thus, Avaramudan requires each network or subnetwork to have a device server 101 that performs protocol conversions. All of these distributed protocol converters must be synchronized for compatibility and release levels, while executing on different hardware in the case of legacy servers. Such duplication, and the expense of upgrading legacy servers, is eliminated by Applicants' invention.

Examiner mentions several times that rearranging parts of an invention involves only routine skill in the art. However, such a generalization does not hold, because most inventions are made of old elements in a new configuration and/or combination. Thus, most inventions are a rearrangement of parts. For example, the most famous invention of all time is the incandescent light, the image of which symbolizes invention. Thomas Edison did not invent the incandescent light. An incandescent light with a carbon filament in an evacuated bulb was previously invented and developed by Joseph Swan and others. Edison obtained a patent by reconfiguring the parts such that the light was more practical.

MPEP 2144.04 VI: C. Rearrangement of Parts
. . . *"The mere fact that a worker in the art could rearrange the parts of the reference device to meet the terms of the claims on appeal is not by itself sufficient to support a finding of obviousness. The prior art must provide a motivation or reason for the worker in the art, without the benefit of appellant's specification, to make the necessary changes in the reference device." Ex parte Chicago Rawhide Mfg. Co., 223 USPQ 351, 353 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1984).*

Conclusion

M.P.E.P. 2143.03 provides that to establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art. If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious.

As argued above, the proposed combinations of Jeong, Avaramudan, Detampel, Potter, and Pinard do not produce the invention claimed in the independent claims herein. Thus the proposed combinations do support the obviousness rejections of the claimed invention. Applicants feel this application is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested.

The commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees due in connection with this paper, including the fees specified in 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 (c), 1.17(a)(1) and 1.20(d), or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-2179.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 10-23-2008

By: Janet D. Hood

Janet D. Hood
Registration No. 61,142
(407) 736-4234

Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, New Jersey 08830